

Dokumentation

Wenn „richtige“ Männer nicht mehr kämpfen

Albert Schweitzer Haus, Wien
31. Jänner 2012



© Petra Rautenstrauch

*Die Dokumentation wurde von **Lucija Zigrovic** verfasst
und von **Nadja Schuster** lektoriert.*

Herausgeber:
Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation (VIDC)
Möllwaldplatz 5/3, A-1040 Vienna, www.vidc.org

Verfassung der Dokumentation: Lucija Zigrovic

Lektorat: Nadja Schuster

Copyright Fotos: Petra Rautenstrauch

Veröffentlichung gemäß §25 des Mediengesetzes mit Novelle 2005 der Republik Österreich.

Copyright: Wiener Institut für Internationalen Dialog und Zusammenarbeit, Möllwaldplatz 5/3, A-1040 Wien. Hauptgegenstand: Diskussionspapers zur Entwicklungspolitik, internationaler Zusammenarbeit und kulturellem Austausch zwischen Nord und Süd sowie Anti-Rassismus Kampagnen.

Die hier dargestellten Meinungen sind die der AutorInnen, die sich nicht mit der Meinung des Herausgebers (VIDC) und der Redaktion decken müssen.

INHALT

NADJA SCHUSTER	4
SABINE MANDL	5
RITA SCHÄFER	6
DEAN PEACOCK	12
PUBLIKUMSDISKUSSION	33
PROFILE DER EXPERTINNEN	38

Begrüßung

Nadja Schuster



Geschätztes Publikum, sehr verehrte PodiumsteilnehmerInnen, ich begrüße sie sehr herzlich zu unserer heutigen Veranstaltung. Mein Name ist Nadja Schuster – ich bin Referentin am VIDC – Wiener Institut. Das Thema der heutigen Veranstaltung ist die Überwindung männlicher Gewaltmuster in Nachkriegsgesellschaften. Nachkriegsgesellschaften sind mit unterschiedlichen Strukturproblemen konfrontiert. Ein massives Problem ist die geschlechtsspezifische Gewalt. Diese Gewalt richtet sich häufig, aber nicht nur gegen Frauen und Mädchen, denn auch Buben und Männer sind

Opfer von Gewalt.

Um die Gewaltprägung von Männlichkeit zu ändern und zu Gendergerechtigkeit beizutragen, ist es notwendig militarisierte Männlichkeitskonzepte zu überwinden. Im Krieg haben sich Jungen und Männer über die Waffe definiert und sich durch die Waffe Macht verschafft. Auch Sexualität haben sie häufig nur in Verbindung mit Gewalt erfahren.

Diese Ansätze zur Gewaltüberwindung sind ein Schlüssel zu nachhaltigen Friedensprozessen, Menschenrechten, Gesundheit und Demokratie. Aus diesem Grund ist die Überwindung kriegerischer Gewaltmuster eine große Herausforderung, die auch von der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit angenommen werden sollte. Ein Highlight der heutigen Veranstaltung ist die Präsentation der Studie zu militarisierter Männlichkeit, die von Frau Dr. Rita Schäfer im Auftrag des VIDC erstellt wurde. Frau Dr. Schäfer ist unabhängige Konsultantin und Forscherin zu Gender-Themen in Kriegen. Ich möchte Sie ganz herzlich willkommen heißen und die Gelegenheit nutzen, mich für die sehr fruchtbare und angenehme Kooperation zu bedanken. Die VIDC Studie beschreibt Ansätze und innovative Projekte unterschiedlicher UN-Organisationen und NGOs in Afrika. Hier liegt der regionale Schwerpunkt. Sie umfasst aber auch Initiativen aus Asien, Lateinamerika und Südost-Europa. Ebenso wurde die Arbeit der Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA) in diesem Bereich analysiert.

Durch diese Studie wird deutlich, dass viele Organisationen mit Männern und Burschen als Akteure der Veränderung arbeiten und häufig mit Frauen-, Kinderrechts- und Aids-Organisationen kooperieren. Dadurch wird auch der Zusammenhang zwischen sexueller Gewalt und Aids verdeutlicht, denn durch die Reduzierung von Vergewaltigungen verringert sich auch die Verbreitung von Aids.

Diese Zusammenarbeit unterschiedlicher AkteurInnen trägt u.a. auch dazu bei, diese Organisationen als kritische Beobachter staatlicher Institutionen zu stärken.

Es ist allerdings verwunderlich, dass es kaum spezielle Projekte für Kindersoldaten gibt, die sich explizit mit deren Männlichkeits- und Gewaltsozialisation auseinandersetzen. Deshalb ist es wichtig, Projekte zu analysieren, die ihre Zielgruppe weiter fassen. Warum das so ist, können wir später noch gern mit unseren ExpertInnen diskutieren.

Aktualität erfährt das Thema durch die 2011 erlassene UN-Resolution (1998) zum Schutz des Kindes. Die Empfehlungen in unserer Studie unterstützen die Ziele der Resolution 1325, die versucht die Rolle der Frau in Friedensprozessen zu stärken. Die Förderung von Männerorganisationen sollte komplementär verlaufen und nicht in Konkurrenz zum Empowerment von Frauen gesehen werden.

Diese Studie baut auf die Arbeit des VIDC zu Gender-Themen, Kinderrechten und Kindersoldaten in Post-Konfliktgesellschaften auf. Beispielsweise gab es im April 2010 eine Veranstaltung zu Kindern im Krieg und auf der Flucht, in der die Umsetzung der Kinderrechtskonvention kritisch beleuchtet wurde.

Durch diese Veranstaltung wollen wir darauf hinweisen, wie wichtig es ist, gezielt mit Männern und männlichen Jugendlichen zu arbeiten, um in Nachkriegsländern Gewaltmuster zu überwinden und zu Gendergerechtigkeit beizutragen. Wir werden dieses Thema weiterverfolgen und auch in künftigen Projekten bzw. Veranstaltungen weiter aufgreifen.

Ich übergebe nun das Wort an Sabine Mandl vom Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Menschenrechte, die uns durch den Abend begleiten wird.

Sabine Mandl



Danke Nadja. Wunderschönen guten Abend, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren. Ich freue mich sie bei dieser Veranstaltung des VIDC begrüßen zu können. Ich bin wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Menschenrechte im Bereich Frauenrechte und seit circa eineinhalb Jahren widme ich mich dem Thema Frauen in bewaffneten Konflikten und Friedensarbeit. Vor kurzem habe ich einen Bildungsprojekt für Schulen mit dem Titel „Krieg und bewaffnete Konflikte - Ohne Frauen kein Frieden“ durchgeführt. In Rahmen dieses Projekts haben wir Unterrichtsmaterialien für die Umsetzung der Themen Krieg, Frieden und Sicherheit in der Schule entwickelt. Daneben unterrichte ich seit mehr als 10 Jahren als externe Lektorin in der Lehrerausbildung an der Historischen Fakultät der Universität Wien. Hier mache ich mit meinen Studierenden eine Übung, in der sie die Frage beantworten sollen, ob Frauen friedfertiger als Männer sind. Ich habe diese Frage schon öfters mit meinen Studierenden diskutiert und es erstaunt mich immer wieder zu sehen, wie rigide Stereotype sich weiterhin manifestieren. Es

kommt mir auch vor, dass die Arbeit mit Männern in diesem Gender-Bereich in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion und in der Öffentlichkeit größtenteils ignoriert wird. Ich hoffe, dass die Studie von Fr. Dr. Schäfer diese wissenschaftliche Lücke schließen wird.

Rita Schäfer



Wie schon erwähnt wurde, ist das Thema der Studie „Männer als Täter und Opfer in kriegerischen Konflikten“. In der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit in Nachkriegsgesellschaften ist es wichtig, vielfältige und widersprüchliche Kriegserfahrungen von Knaben, Jugendlichen und Männern genauer zu analysieren und in Projektplanungen sowie der Projektpraxis zu beachten.

Differenzierte Gender-Perspektiven sind notwendig, um die Gewaltakzeptanz und die verbreitete geschlechtsspezifische und sexualisierte Gewalt zu beenden. Das betrifft nicht nur die Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen, sondern auch die Gewalt zwischen Männern. Diese wird meistens nicht als genderspezifisches Problem betrachtet. Oft wird keine Gender-Dimension darauf gerichtet.

Es ist wichtig zu sehen, dass die Gefährdung der vielerorts labilen Friedensprozesse durch die Gewalt zwischen Jugendlichen und Männern ein Problem ist, das überwunden werden muss. Diese Gewalt betrifft aber nicht nur die lokale Bevölkerung sondern auch die MitarbeiterInnen internationaler Organisationen, der UN und Blauhelmsoldaten. In einigen aktuellen Studien wird deutlich, dass die UN Soldaten ihr Verhalten an lokale Muster anpassen. Die Mitarbeiter internationaler Organisation sind also mit der Gewalt konfrontiert, die Ex-Kämpfer mit in die Nachkriegsgesellschaft hineinbringen.

Was sind die Ursachen dieser nachkriegserischen Gewalt? Viele Ex-Kämpfer oder Soldaten werden mehrheitlich in eine unsichere Zukunft und in die Arbeitslosigkeit entlassen. Hier müssen wir auch die männlichen Selbstbilder betrachten. Es geht um die Identitätszuschreibungen der Männer, die jahrelang ihre Identität und Selbstbewusstsein aus dem Kampf bezogen haben. Diese jungen Männer wurden in Kriege hinein sozialisiert. Sie lernten oft nichts anderes als gewaltsames Machthandeln kennen. Sie lernten nie Konflikte gewaltfrei zu lösen. Zudem müssen wir sehen, dass diese Jugendlichen sehr jung, viel jünger als im zivilen Leben, sogenannte männliche Aufgaben übernehmen. Das sind die Aufgaben, die in ihren Gesellschaften eigentlich erwachsenen Männern vorbehalten sind. Zudem müssen wir auch erkennen, dass diese jungen Männer manchmal die Macht der ältesten Männer aktiv angreifen. Dieses Generationsverhältnis zwischen Männern wird oft gewaltsam in Frage gestellt und attackiert. Außerdem müssen wir berücksichtigen, dass Jugendliche

oft zwangsrekrutiert werden. Das bedeutet, dass sie sowohl Täter als auch Opfer sind. Viele Gewalttäter wurden nicht nur mit der Bedrohung durch Feinde, sondern auch mit Demütigung und Todesangst durch die eigenen Einheiten konfrontiert. Sie litten oft unter Erniedrigungen in den eigenen Reihen, um diese später am Gegner zu kompensieren. Hier geht es um sehr komplexe Gewaltmuster und manchmal ist es sehr schwer zu beurteilen, wer Opfer und wer Täter ist. Die meisten Ex-Kämpfer haben sehr widersprüchliche Erfahrungen gemacht, die sie in ihren Alltag übernehmen. Offizielle Demobilisierungsprogramme nehmen diese Gewaltmuster nicht wahr und fokussieren meistens nur auf die Abgabe der Waffe. Sehr wenige Demobilisierungsprogramme richten sich an die Reintegration der Ex-Kämpfer.

Diese Studie beschäftigt sich mit diesen Problemen, zeigt aber auch Lösungsansätze. Sie liefert Beispiele von Projekten und Programmen aus einzelnen Ländern, die zeigen, wie mit Jungen und Männer gearbeitet werden kann und wie diese Gewalt verlernt werden kann. Die Studie skizziert die Männlichkeitsprägung vor und während Kriegen und geht dabei auf die Problematik der Kindersoldaten ein. An Länderbeispielen werden Projekte und Programme erläutert, die zu Einstellungs- und Verhaltensänderungen von Knaben, Jugendlichen und Männern nach Kriegen oder Gewaltkonflikten beitragen. Im Mittelpunkt stehen innovative Ansätze aus afrikanischen Ländern. Zudem werden auch Beispiele von anderen Kontinenten vorgestellt. Bei der Auswahl wird auf die Schwerpunkt- und Kooperationsländer der österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA) Bezug genommen. Detaillierte Bezüge zu den Leitlinien der Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und zu internationalen Abkommen werden hergestellt.

Um die Ziele der Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit wie Menschenrechte, Gendergerechtigkeit, Verwirklichung der Frauen- und Kinderrechte, Friedensförderung und Konfliktprävention zu erreichen, ist es wichtig geschlechtsspezifische Gewalt (auch gegen Knaben und Männer) zu überwinden und zu reduzieren. Das bedeutet die Unterstützung solcher Organisationen, die an Veränderung von diesen Gewaltmustern arbeiten.

Diese Studie baut auf die bisherige Arbeit des Wiener Instituts für internationalen Dialog und Zusammenarbeit (VIDC) zu Gender und Kindern in bewaffneten Konflikten auf. Hier möchte ich besonders die sogenannten **Genderboxen** erwähnen, die sehr informativ und im Internet leicht zugänglich sind (<http://www.vidc.org/projekte/gender/genderbox/>).

An zahlreichen konkreten Beispielen werden in der Studie Erfahrungen auf lokaler, nationaler und internationaler Ebene und die themenrelevante Arbeit unterschiedlicher Organisationen der Vereinten Nationen sowie zahlreicher Nichtregierungsorganisationen veranschaulicht. Es handelt sich um Projekte zur Bildungs- und Bewusstseinsarbeit über die männliche Geschlechtsidentität,

Sexualität, Vaterschaft und Gesundheit. Nennenswert sind auch Kultur-, Medien- und Sportprogramme. Diese setzen auf die Gemeinschaftsbildung der Jugendlichen. In den Ansätzen werden Männer nicht als eine homogene Gruppe betrachtet sondern als Männer mit unterschiedlicher Kriegserfahrung und Herkunft und unterschiedlichem sozialen Status. So illustriert diese Studie wie Projekte und Programme Knaben, Jugendliche und auch junge Männer (mit unterschiedlicher Herkunft und Kriegserfahrung) als "change agents" motivieren und stärken können. Ihr Motto lautet: Jeder Mann kann sich ändern! Die Gewalterfahrung ist kein Schicksal – es gibt Auswege zu wählen!

Die Studie bietet auch Beispiele dafür wie Männer in Gender-Programme gezielt integriert werden können. Dabei ist zu beachten das isolierte "Empowerment"-Ansätze von Frauen für grundlegende Veränderungen nicht reichen, sondern sogar durch die Abwehr von Männern kontraproduktiv sein können. Grundlegende Veränderungen sind nur möglich wenn Männer angesprochen werden. Die Gewalt in der Familie steigt manchmal, wenn Männer sich von den Angeboten, die sich nur an Frauen richten, ausgeschlossen fühlen. Umso wichtiger ist es, Männer aktiv in Problemlösungen einzubeziehen und als tragende Kräfte der Veränderung zu gewinnen. Nur so können Konflikte entschärft und nachhaltige Transformationsprozesse in Gang gesetzt werden. Dies betrifft auch Programme staatlicher Behörden, Gender-Gremien und politischer EntscheidungsträgerInnen.

Diese Studie gibt auch Hinweise darauf wie mit Autoritäten gearbeitet werden kann. Die Macht traditioneller, religiöser und lokaler Autoritäten wird exemplarisch problematisiert, zumal sie Veränderungsprozesse fördern oder beeinträchtigen können. Die männlichen Autoritäten sind Schlüsselpersonen, die Wandel voranbringen können, wenn sie als Akteure der Veränderung angesprochen sind.

Veränderung ist kein linearer Prozess, sondern braucht Zeit und Geduld sowie Austausch und Vernetzungen, um Fehler zu vermeiden und Erfolgsgeschichten anzuwenden und zu verbreiten.

Jetzt können wir uns ansehen, welche **Empfehlungen** sich davon ableiten lassen.

Erstens ergibt sich eine Herausforderung an der institutionellen Ebene, **institutionelle Strukturreformen zu schaffen**. Demobilisierungs- und Reintegrationsprogramme sollten an den Problemen und Prioritäten der Ex-Kombattanten orientiert werden. Es ist wichtig die rechtlichen, politischen und institutionellen Rahmenbedingungen zu ändern. Das betrifft Rechts- und Gesetzesreformen sowie deren Umsetzung im Alltag, auch in peripheren ländlichen Gebieten. Zudem sollten Reformen im Sicherheitssektor auf die systematische Korruptionsbekämpfung, Professionalisierung und Gender-Sensibilisierung von Polizei und Justiz ausgerichtet sein. Deren Ausbildung und Ausstattung muss verbessert werden. Polizisten agierten oft vor und während des

Konfliktes als brutal ausführende Organe und brauchen eine grundlegende Umorientierung. Strafverfolgung von Tätern und Präventionsprogramme gegen geschlechtsspezifische u.a. Gewaltformen sollten verzahnt werden. Dazu sind kontinuierliche Gender-Trainings erforderlich, die insbesondere Männlichkeitsprägungen und Veränderungsoptionen thematisieren. Staatliche Institutionen und die Medien können dazu beitragen, die Gewaltakzeptanz zu reduzieren und Geschlechternormen zu ändern.

Institutionelle Strukturveränderungen sollten auch Gesundheitseinrichtungen und Schulen umfassen. Die verbesserte Ausstattung und die Fortbildung des Personals sind vielerorts dringend notwendig. Insbesondere in der Ausbildung von Lehrern sollten Gender-Leitlinien, die Ziele der Kinder- und Jugendförderung und Null-Toleranz-Richtlinien gegen sexuelle Übergriffe auf Schülerinnen und gegen Gewalt an Schülern enthalten sein. Die Verwirklichung reproduktiver Rechte, Schutz vor HIV-Infektionen und die Überwindung von Homophobie sollten ebenfalls Ziele sein. Die Gender- und die Jugendpolitik sollten einen höheren Stellenwert erhalten und umgesetzt werden. Notwendig wären multi-sektorale Programme, etwa die Kombination rechtlicher und institutioneller Veränderungen auf Gemeinde- und Stadtteilebene, in der Jugend- und Bildungspolitik, die Verbindung unterschiedlicher Handlungsebenen sowie die Kooperation zwischen verschiedenen Ministerien und "Stakeholdern" inklusive der Nicht-Regierungsorganisationen. Schließlich ist die Verwirklichung von Gendergerechtigkeit durch Überwindung gewaltgeprägter Männlichkeit ein wesentlicher Beitrag zur sozialen Gerechtigkeit und Demokratisierung.

Post-Konflikt Gesellschaften bestehen oft aus mehr als 50% Jugendlichen. In der **Arbeit mit Knaben und Jugendlichen** spielt die Peer-Gruppenarbeit zum Einstellungs- und Verhaltenswandel eine zentrale Rolle. Die Pubertät sollte nicht als Problemphase, sondern als Chance betrachtet werden. Hier können Gewaltlegitimationen und Geschlechterstereotypen überwunden werden. Die Peer-Gruppenarbeit kann mit anderen Transformationsansätzen im Rahmen multi-sektoraler Konzepte verbunden werden, insbesondere mit solchen, die Männer als Akteure der Veränderung ansprechen. Wichtig ist es alters- und interessensspezifisch vorzugehen und sichere Orte für Knaben, Jugendliche und Männer zu schaffen. Notwendig sind Plattformen, auf denen die Teilnehmenden über verinnerlichte Normen, den Druck des sozialen Umfeldes zur Normenerfüllung und ihre Selbstwahrnehmung sprechen können. Es ist wichtig, Differenzen und Interessensdivergenzen zwischen Knaben, Jugendlichen und Männern auf der Basis von Herkunft, Familienstand, Religion oder Wohnort zu beachten. Auch divergierende Kriegserfahrungen sind zu berücksichtigen.

Lehrer, religiöse oder traditionelle Autoritäten und lokal anerkannte Männer können Geschlechterstereotypen und Gewaltlegitimationen festigen oder überwinden. Deshalb sollten sie in die Konzeption entsprechender Transformationsstrategien eingebunden werden. Ihre Gender-Stereotypen müssen überwunden und ihre Bereitschaft zur Transformation von Gender-

Zuschreibungen in Institutionen und Organisationen muss verbessert werden. Auch Mitarbeiter in Medien sollten sich ihrer Verantwortung für Gender-Zuschreibungen bewusst sein und Stereotypen überwinden. Es ist wichtig neue Rollenbilder und neue Orientierungen für die Sozialisation von Knaben zu vermitteln. Auf familiärer Ebene sollten Familienväter verstärkt angesprochen werden, schließlich obliegt es ihnen, ihren Söhnen Orientierungen zu geben und Konflikte gewaltfrei zu lösen. Hilfreich für Organisationen, die an Einstellungsveränderungen von Knaben, Jugendlichen und Männern arbeiten, sind das **systematische Monitoring und die Evaluierungen bzw. Selbstevaluierungen ihrer Arbeit**. Regelmäßige Mitarbeiterfortbildungen sowie die Vernetzung mit Organisationen, die ebenfalls in diesem Kontext arbeiten, sichern die Nachhaltigkeit und die Verbreitung von Erfolgen sowie das Vermeiden von Fehlern. Eine Herausforderung ist die Suche nach Möglichkeiten erfolgreiche Strategien und Konzepte, die sich lokal bewährt haben, auf andere Länder zu übertragen und dort lokal anzupassen. Der kontinuierliche regionale Austausch ist hierfür die Grundlage. Oft handelt es sich um Pilotprojekte. Es gibt kaum Follow-ups, die mittel- und langfristige Finanzierung ist zumeist nicht gesichert, was kompetente und erfahrene Mitarbeiter zum Wechsel in andere Organisationen veranlasst. Der Dialog mit Frauen-, Kinder-, HIV/AIDS- und Homosexuellenorganisationen ist wichtig, um deren Sorgen zu mildern, Männerprojekte würden finanzielle Forderungen an sich ziehen.

Im Kontext der **HIV-Prävention** sollte reflektiert werden, wie Gesundheits-, Gender- und Anti-Gewaltprojekte kooperieren können und in welchen Situationen sowie unter welchen Bedingungen Jugendliche und junge Männer zu verantwortungsvollem Sexualverhalten und zum Schutz vor HIV-Infektionen für sich und ihre PartnerInnen bereit sind. Auch die Frage, wie wichtig risikoreiche Sexualität für das maskuline Selbstbild insbesondere von jungen Männern und die Anerkennung durch ihr soziales Umfeld (Freunde, Peer-Gruppe, andere Männer, andere Frauen) ist, sollte in Planungen berücksichtigt werden. Grundsätzlich sollte der Gesundheitssektor sich stärker an Männern orientieren, insbesondere bei HIV-Beratungen, um die vielerorts anzutreffenden Stigmatisierungen der Ratsuchenden, Infizierten oder Kranken durch weibliches Gesundheitspersonal, wie Krankenschwestern und HIV-Beraterinnen, zu vermeiden. Ein Tabubereich im Kontext dieser Arbeit sind die Vergewaltigungen von Männer und Jungen. Die ÄrztInnen und Krankenschwestern gehen nicht darauf ein, weil sie sexualisierte Gewalt nur mit Frauen und Mädchen verbinden. Jetzt wissen wir jedoch, dass die Vergewaltigungen gegen Männer auch eine Kriegsstrategie sind. Eine Erweiterung der Sicht ist nötig, so dass Männer auch Hilfe erhalten.

Wie schon erwähnt, gibt es direkte **konzeptionelle Bezüge zur Genderleitlinie der OEZA**. Die Arbeitsschritte und Ziele sind in vielfältiger Weise mit der OEZA verknüpft. So gibt es direkte Bezüge

zu den Leitlinien zur Gleichstellung der Geschlechter, zu Kinder- und Menschenrechten, zur Konfliktprävention und Friedenssicherung.

Hinsichtlich der Genderleitlinien ist hervorzuheben, dass bereits einige österreichische Entwicklungsorganisationen im Austausch mit lokalen Frauenorganisationen innovative Ansätze zur Arbeit mit Männern durchführen. Teilweise sind diese schon vernetzt und tauschen ihre Erfahrungen aus. Solche Kooperationen könnten intensiviert, institutionell verankert und systematisiert werden. Dazu ist eine kontinuierlichere Förderung notwendig, denn oft sind die Ansätze nur als Pilotprojekte geplant, deren konkrete Wirkungen und Reichweite systematischer analysiert und ausgeweitet werden könnten, zumal viele dieser Projekte sehr erfolgreich sind. Nachhaltige Einstellungs- und Verhaltensänderungen sowie gesellschaftliche Veränderungen brauchen Zeit und mittelfristige Finanzierungssicherheit, um Organisationen Planungssicherheit zu geben und die Personalfuktuation einzuschränken.

Auch innovative Organisationen, die insbesondere junge Männer nach Kriegen und Gewaltkonflikten gründeten, verstehen sich ausdrücklich als Allianzpartner von Frauen-, Kinderrechts-, Homosexuellen- und AIDS-Organisationen. Sie argumentieren mit einem umfassenden Gender-Begriff, der sich nicht auf die Hierarchien zwischen Frauen und Männer beschränkt, sondern Geschlechterverhältnisse mit anderen Machtverhältnissen in Beziehung setzt und Geschlechtergleichheit als Beitrag zur sozialen Gerechtigkeit und zur Verwirklichung von Menschenrechten betrachtet. Diese jungen Aktivisten sind couragiert, weil sie Kritik an alten Eliten, an Machtmissbrauch, Korruption und politischer Patronage üben und sich als zivilgesellschaftliche Akteure verstehen, die Demokratisierungsprozesse in ihren gewaltgeprägten und von Kriegen erschütterten Gesellschaften voranbringen wollen. Sie verlangen von ihren Regierungen Rechts- und Gesetzesreformen sowie deren Umsetzung in der Rechtspraxis, insbesondere auch in ländlichen Gebieten. Aus diesen Gründen wäre es wünschenswert, dass solche Ansätze unter Bezug auf die Genderleitlinien konzeptionell berücksichtigt und in der OEZA stärker beachtet würden.

Mit Blick auf den **Aktionsplan zur UN-Resolution 1325** zu „Frauen, Frieden und Sicherheit“ kann die Arbeit mit Männern und Männerorganisationen die Erreichung der Ziele fördern, konkret die Gewaltprävention und den Schutz vor Gewalt. Die Überwindung gewaltgeprägter Männlichkeit nach Kriegen und Gewaltkonflikten durch konkrete Programm- und Projektansätze verbessert die Sicherheit von Frauen und Mädchen im öffentlichen und privaten Raum und trägt zur Umsetzung des Konzeptes der menschlichen Sicherheit im umfassenden Sinn bei.

Um demobilisierten männlichen Kindersoldaten **Zukunftsperspektiven** zu ermöglichen, sind umfassende Programmansätze notwendig, die ihre Interessen an einer eigenständigen

Existenzsicherung, ihre Gesundheitsprobleme wie HIV-Infektionen und Drogenabhängigkeit, ihre Trauma durch erlittene und selbst verübte Gewalt sowie ihre Gewaltbereitschaft aufarbeiten. Die Vermittlung gewaltfreier Konfliktlösungen, Männlichkeitsbilder und maskuliner Identitätsstiftungen wäre ebenfalls sehr wichtig. Innovative Maßnahmen könnten in eine Jugendpolitik, die den Interessen der Jugendlichen entgegenkommt, und in umfassenden Jugendprogrammen eingebettet sein sowie der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit gegensteuern, Zukunftsperspektiven vermitteln und Jugendliche bzw. Knaben als Akteure für Veränderungsprozesse gewinnen. Im Idealfall könnten so erneute Gewalteskalationen verhindert werden.

Zur nachhaltigen Verankerung innovativer Ansätze in der Jugendarbeit sind **politische Leitlinien, umfassende Rechtsreformen** und deren Umsetzung sowie breit gefächerte Maßnahmen zur sozialen Gerechtigkeit entscheidend. Der politische Dialog mit den verantwortlichen EntscheidungsträgerInnen könnte nachdrücklich darauf hinwirken, Rechtsstaatlichkeit herzustellen. Dies betrifft auch grundlegende Reformen von Polizei und Justiz, um das Vertrauen der Bevölkerung, insbesondere der Jugendlichen, in diese rechtsstaatlichen Institutionen zu stärken. Auch der Machtmissbrauch von Lehrern in Schulen muss gestoppt und sanktioniert werden, denn darunter leiden Mädchen, Knaben und Jugendliche. Gleichzeitig ist es wichtig, die Gender-Organisationen als zivilgesellschaftliche Kräfte zu stärken, die kritisch die Umsetzung von Rechtsreformen und institutionellen Strukturveränderungen beobachten können, dadurch die Interessen von BürgerInnen gegenüber den Nachkriegsregierungen vertreten und somit zur Demokratisierung beitragen.

Dean Peacock



I would like to start by thanking the Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation for the invitation to speak at this seminar on men, masculinities, and violence in conflict and post-conflict settings. It is a tremendous honor to be able to share this panel with such distinguished speakers in a city with such a long history of debate and reflection. I would also like to acknowledge colleagues who have assisted me in formulating the thoughts I'm going to share here. Sisonke Msimang, Director of the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa, Gary Barker, founding director of Instituto Promundo, and Michael Kaufman, founder of the Global White Ribbon Campaign all provided me with invaluable comments and guidance. Vanessa Farr, a pioneering activist and scholar on gender and conflict, wrote sections of this paper in her gorgeous

prose and shaped the ideas in it in very significant ways. I'm deeply grateful to them for their insights, generosity and support.

Tonight's topic of sexual violence in conflict settings is a difficult one to talk about so I want to start with a cautious note of hope. Presenting here in peaceful Vienna allows me to feel optimistic about the possibility that Africa might one day look back on its wars of the late twentieth and early twentieth centuries as a distant memory in the same way that I imagine Europeans now do of the terrible wars that scarred this continent up to, and in the 20th century.

Of course, the new Europe at peace with itself did not come into being without a high level of organisation to critique war, militarisation and their economic and political underpinnings. The gendered dynamics of war also did not go unremarked: it's important that much of this work was done by women, for example, the founders of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, who met in The Hague in 1915 to decry what was then still being called the Great War. Yet it is still all too common to overlook the tremendous efforts of women activists, including feminist scholars, to connect gendered oppression with male domination and work out an oppositional stance from that analysis. In the increasingly conservative global climate, it's not very often remembered that the political will and new international institutions that were set up to support Europe's commitment to peace were the result of careful political collaborations; and it certainly did not happen without great personal sacrifice and enormous financial resources, including previously unimagined foreign aid.

To resolve sexual violence in conflict we're going to need similar deep wells of imagination and courage, alliance-building, political will and intellectual support. We're also going to need serious, measurable and universally-agreed on systems of accountability, something we currently lack. Moreover, we're going to need our international institutions to maintain their commitment to providing 0.7% of GDP in foreign aid rather than cutting back as they're currently doing. This funding is not the luxury it may seem to be.

I want to remind everyone here that there is a continuum in the forms of violence used by those who have power to subjugate and those who do not, and also to point out that there are differences in the way people can access and wield power which we need to examine carefully if we want to succeed in challenging the discrimination that results from the misuse of such power. One way to do this is to ask questions: Why, for example, don't we talk about what it is that really separates violence in the home in Vienna, from violence on the streets in Athens, from violence in the forest outside Goma? Is it the scale and viciousness of the violence alone? Is it the fact that one is still seen

as private while the other is considered public, and publicised further by the media? Is it the speed and efficiency with which police and the justice system in these different places react – if they ever do? Getting those connections is a vital part of challenging the different levels at which power is gained and misused, which is necessary to establishing functioning systems of gender justice and extending them to all.

There's another part of this intersectionality that is also given too little attention, and my comments today will focus on this point: what is it that connects the Palestinian brother who escorts his little sister across an Israeli checkpoint to school each morning, to the Sowetan son who goes home early on payday so he helps his mother feed his younger siblings, to the Parisian dad who takes his kids to the park while his spouse finishes a work assignment? While so much attention is given to ending gendered forms of violence, or to focusing on "the problem that is men", how can the daily peacefulness of so many men be acknowledged – and amplified and celebrated and organised? How can we best involve men and boys in preventing domestic and sexual violence, and more ambitiously, how can we engage men and boys as agents of gender justice, as opponents to militarised masculinity, and as champions of human rights for all? My answers to these questions will be informed by my work at two organizations: Sonke Gender Justice Network and the MenEngage Alliance.

Established just five years ago, **Sonke Gender Justice (Sonke)** is a South African NGO working across Africa to engage men and boys in achieving gender equality and working specifically to address the intersection of masculinities, gender based violence and HIV and AIDS. We work across all of South Africa's nine provinces and in about fifteen countries in Africa, including a number of conflict and post-conflict settings such as Cote D'Ivoire, Burundi, Sudan, Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda, where we are working closely with UNDP, UNFPA and the International Centre for Research on Women to carry out research on the gender and HIV dimensions of conflict and post-conflict situations and to develop policies and programmes to support emerging efforts to engage men and boys in gender transformation. Sonke employs a range of social change strategies to challenge harmful notions and expressions of masculinities and to promote gender equality—from individual and small group education to mass media and the use of community mobilisation and advocacy to secure the passage and implementation of new laws and policies. We work hard to hold political leaders and institutions to account and use the controversy that this often generates to encourage inclusive national debate through the media about the roles and responsibilities of men in public positions—especially those in senior positions of power within government, key political offices and the private sector. Sonke also serves as global co-chair of the MenEngage Alliance.

The **MenEngage Alliance** was established in 2006 to increase men's involvement in achieving gender equality with a strong focus on preventing gender based violence. MenEngage country networks have since been established in over 30 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and North America. Many of the organisations that make up the MenEngage Alliance are in countries with recent histories of conflict, including in Africa: Rwanda, Sierra Leone, DRC, Burundi, Uganda, Ethiopia, Cote D'Ivoire and my own country, South Africa.

Our work with men and boys has attracted significant attention over the last few years, including some controversy. It's worth saying a few words about what this work is and is not. Both Sonke and MenEngage are guided by the following principles: we work towards gender equality and women's rights, we strive to be accountable to women's rights organisations and movements, we believe men are diverse and shaped by many different life circumstances and experiences but share the common experience of finding existing gender roles restrictive, stifling and often dangerous for our own and our partners' health. We believe that change requires working closely with women's rights organisations and other social movements to demand a more just world—for women and girls, men and boys. Increasingly, this means that our work goes beyond running workshops and engaging in community education. We are becoming more and more politically engaged as we strive to hold our political leaders and institutions to account for their commitments and obligations. I hope that it is clear that neither Sonke nor MenEngage, nor the organisations that make up the alliance are "men's rights organisations" involved in a backlash against women's rights. Indeed, the experiences of many of my colleagues at Sonke and within the MenEngage Alliance inform and hopefully embody our principles. Many of our members have themselves been affected by violence—as direct victims of Apartheid-era violence or armed conflict in West Africa and the Great Lakes region or, in some cases, exposed to domestic violence in their homes of origin or forced to witness indescribably cruel sexual violence inflicted against family members during situations of civil war. Many of our members, too, are not victims: they are caring men who are, or wish to be, in loving, generous and equal relations with women. To be this way often requires daily acts of quiet courage and resistance to dominant images of masculinity. They join us because they see the importance of sharing their actions with others who may not yet have the same capacity to bring positive change in their homes, schools and workplaces. Whether borne of anguish and hardship or of generosity and existing capacity and desire to be catalysts for change, their determination to work with each other to prevent domestic and sexual violence celebrates the fact that men too have a stake in creating a world where they, and women, are able to live joyful lives that are free from the threat and trauma of violence.

With these background musings in place, I will now turn to the topic at hand: how do we understand sexual violence in conflict and post-conflict settings, and what we can do to mobilise men and boys to take action to end it?

I'm fortunate to serve on the advisory council to the Nobel Women's Initiative new campaign to end gender based violence in conflict. When we last met I sat at lunch with Denis Mukwenge, the widely revered medical doctor based at the Panzi Hospital in Bukavu, in the Democratic Republic of Congo's war-torn South Kivu province. Himself a survivor of the 1996 civil war, Dr Mukwenge provides medical services to rape survivors, including emergency surgery to women who have been literally torn apart by brutal rapes, including very often gang rapes or rapes perpetrated with objects. With fatigue palpable in his voice and eyes, Doctor Mukwenge told a group of us that now in 2011 he is operating on some women for the third time—women who he did not think would survive their first fistula surgery are now showing up for the third time, some with their daughters, and sometimes their sons, also in need of emergency services. It's hard to get ones head around.

Of course, the violence isn't just in the DRC. The January 2012 UN Secretary General's report on sexual violence in conflict is hard to read. It doesn't tell us much we haven't heard before though. It's filled with stories of brutal rapes committed by soldiers and by armed combatants. Some of the countries listed are familiar to us, others listed as sites of routine violence against women in conflict are new, like Egypt, Libya and other Arab Spring settings. It includes the following damning passages: "The last year has seen several new and ongoing armed conflicts where sexual violence was widespread and, in some instances, may have been systematically targeted at civilians by armed forces and armed groups, in order to punish, humiliate and destroy. Mass rapes against women and girls were also witnessed. The general breakdown in law and order, the absence of justice, continuing conflict, entrenched discriminatory attitudes and practices and the prevailing culture of impunity in these situations allowed for these crimes to be committed not only with appalling consequences for the victims, but with a force that destroys the fabric of society as a whole. In all these situations, cases of conflict-related sexual violence remain largely unreported owing to several factors, such as social stigma, fear of reprisals, insecurity, a lack of available response services and the perceived futility of reporting as a result of weak administration of justice, apathy and political pressure."

Stark and alarming as its language is, the very existence of a UN Secretary General's annual report on sexual violence in conflict settings indicates that women's rights activists – and increasingly, activists who draw attention to sexualised violence in conflict that targets males – have been successful in drawing attention to the urgency of the issue and mobilising UN commitment to addressing it. As the

issue becomes more public, so the language defining the violations becomes more refined: I will discuss this point in more detail later.

The UN Security Council and its signatory states have also made a range of commitments to addressing sexual violence in conflict. These include a number of Security Council Resolutions on women, peace and security including SCR 1325 on women and peacekeeping, passed in 2000, SCR 1820 on sexualised violence in conflict, passed in 2008 and SCR 1960 passed in 2010 to reaffirm and deepen commitments made on women, peace and security. The Secretary General has also appointed a Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict and many UN agencies, including especially those involved in post-conflict disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration are attempting to address sexual violence as a priority.

Outside of the UN system there is also significant attention to the issue of sexual violence in conflict. The Nobel Women's Initiative, established by Women Nobel Peace Prize laureates, has launched a high profile Campaign to End Gender Based Violence in Conflict and late last year the Nobel Peace Prize was jointly to Ellen Johnson Sirleaf and Leymah Gbowee from Liberia and Tawakkol Karman from Yemen "for their non-violent struggle for the safety of women and for women's rights to full participation in peace-building work". Then, just a week ago, the International Criminal Court decided to bring charges against leading Kenyan politicians for allegedly promoting violence, including sexual violence, in the wake of Kenya's disputed 2008 elections. In July last year, the Refugee Law Project at Makerere University, Uganda, produced a documentary on male survivors of sexual violence called "They Slept With Me", which received significant media coverage, and we at Sonke and the MenEngage Alliance released a documentary film entitled "A Way to Justice" which also sketches out potential ways to understand and address the violence.

As I said earlier, sexualised violence needs to be seen on a continuum of power abuse. Sexualised violence is the same in its intent, and often in its lasting effects, whether it is used in conflict settings or not. Whether in war or peacetime, the perpetration of sexualised violence is driven by socially sanctioned male dominance over women – and over socially weaker men, and children -- by notions of manhood and power that valorise sexual conquest and give powerful men a sense of entitlement with no consequences, as many male politicians have shown us. It's permitted because of social stereotypes that grant some men a sense of entitlement to use and abuse other people's bodies. It's entrenched by slow, ineffectual and often corruptible justice systems, with male-dominated policing systems playing a part in what sometimes looks like systemic impunity. Perhaps most egregiously and hardest to change is exclusionary, male-dominated systems of power that allow men, no matter their

class, race or creed, to trivialise and normalise their own and other men's violence against women, other men, and children, to laugh it off, including through verbal violence, and to treat it as a private matter without fear of serious sanction from either the state or their friends.

If we consider how easy it is for all these social norms and failed institutions to facilitate violence in communities that are not actually at war, then we can begin to see why it is so much more exaggerated in situations of armed conflict. When institutions and social norms break down, as they do in armed conflict, there is little to stop men's use of sexualised violence. The scale and severity of the violence that ensues is a chilling testimony to the fragility of the norms that promote gender equality, or at the very least, help discourage such violence because potential perpetrators fear the consequences of their actions. Think of the complexity of effort it takes to prevent and sanction violence, even in peaceful places, and you will realise that nearly constant effort and significant machinery is needed to keep it in check. What then of a warzone? War interferes with schooling, disrupts economic activities and public institutions. It destroys livelihoods and causes massive social dislocation. War and armed conflict can ruin social cohesion and undermine the rule of law as well as local customary practices and accountability mechanisms that used to protect against domestic and sexual violence. Once war takes hold everyone in the affected society will be traumatised by exposure to violence. Studies of inter-generational violence and trauma show that victims may become more likely to use violence themselves. In some settings men and boys are forced at gunpoint to commit or witness atrocious acts of violence, often directed at their own family or community members. This, then, generates acts of reprisals and the conflict deepens and the atrocities become simultaneously more appalling and more commonplace.

In post-conflict settings, very often the trauma goes unattended to. It not only festers but becomes normalised: in other words, people cannot forget what they saw, did or experienced, but they are simultaneously unable to stop it from happening to others; or they may even forget a time when such violence was not part of their everyday experience. Former combatants who derived their wealth, power and sense of manhood from carrying a gun and having easy access to women's bodies and other spoils of war continue to hold the same attitudes in settings with weak legal and criminal justice systems, failed economies and a fragile peace accord. In addition and controversially, some researchers argue that in post-conflict settings some men resent the attention and resources granted to women by international aid agencies and, as a result, subject women in their homes and communities to retaliatory violence which allows them to maintain control.

No matter the explanations we are offered for why it happens, the violence described in the Secretary General's 2012 report and so many others is endemic and has to be stopped. I will argue that to achieve that goal we have to think differently about how men's roles and responsibilities are determined, and how violent and exploitative behaviours continue to be rewarded, no matter where they occur. Today, I'm going to argue—as we do at Sonke —that it's useful to think of men in three ways when it comes to their varied roles in and relationship to sexual violence in conflict: 1) men as perpetrators of sexual violence, 2) men as primary and secondary victims of other men's sexual violence and 3) men as actual and potential agents of change for gender justice.

Given what I'm going to say next, I want to reiterate what I've hopefully already conveyed. Many men commit rape with impunity and all too frequently face little to no social sanction. Their violence devastates the lives of women, other men, and children, and it has to be stopped. They should face the full extent of the law, whether in their home countries or at the International Criminal Court in The Hague. Nonetheless, while it is true that it is men who commit the vast preponderance of domestic and sexual violence in conflict and post-conflict settings, I want to repeat what I said earlier because it simply is not said enough: it is absolutely critical that we recognise that it is not all men who commit such violence. It is not even the majority of men.

There are so many easy assumptions, accompanied and reinforced by a set of familiar tropes and stereotypes that characterize men, and particularly men in Africa, in terms that are racist, classist and 'othering'. Rape was widespread in Europe during both World Wars One and Two although it's taken decades for this fact to be openly discussed. Rape (of women, men and children) continues, in 'peacetime' Europe, to be one of the most widespread crimes and prosecution rates for such violence, even when it is lethal, remain abysmally low. Yet, men in the global South, and particularly men in Africa, are portrayed quite uniformly in the Western Media as perpetrators, supportive, silent indifferent bystanders, callous and stigmatizing, likely to ostracise and abandon their wife, girlfriend or daughter if she is raped in conflict. They are also characterised as unable to empathise with the suffering of men whose families are victims, and seen as homophobic, incapable of and unwilling to support or acknowledge men who have themselves survived sexual violence. These stereotypes are deeply damaging and problematic for several reasons. They deter women and men from seeking assistance from men who might otherwise provide love and support, they reinforce negative stereotypes, alienate many men and sometimes generate a backlash against women's rights; and they decrease the likelihood that men will be mobilised as advocates for change and for gender justice because they close the space for alternative expressions of masculinity to be celebrated. They play a central role in a vicious cycle because they simply shut down public and private debate on how

men can be different. The stereotypes about African men as violent, indifferent and callous also hide the fact that a significant number of men are themselves raped, sometimes repeatedly. Some are abducted and forced to perpetrate rape in order to stay alive. Finally, almost none of them are given the tools to think differently about themselves or their behaviour towards those closest to them. The stereotype about the violent or indifferent man also hides the fact that many men are deeply troubled by violence committed against women they love and care about. The stereotype makes it difficult to remember that such men have a deep personal investment in bringing the violence to a stop, but worse than that, it prevents men from taking actions for positive change. If we want to meet the needs of survivors of sexualised violence, and if we want to assist communities to address the deep and debilitating trauma left by all other kinds of violence that are perpetrated in conflict, we have to simultaneously hold perpetrators accountable AND recognise that it is critical to engage men as survivors of violence and as potential agents of change.

In a significant departure from many others UN documents, the 2012 SG report acknowledges the emerging evidence indicating that men can also be victims of sexual violence in conflict:

“Sexual violence, and the long shadow of terror and trauma it casts, disproportionately affects women and girls. However, recent information underscores that the situation of male victims and the plight of children born as a result of wartime rape require deeper examination. The issue must be understood from all perspectives and addressed at all levels as part of a comprehensive approach to protecting civilians.”

The acknowledgement by the UN that **men can also be victims of sexual violence in conflict** is important. In many ways it is long overdue. Studies suggest that rape against men is widespread in situations of conflict. The study *Male Rape and Human Rights* documents widespread male rape in war, including in Chile, Greece, Iran, Kuwait, the former Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union. According to the study, nearly three quarters of El Salvadoran male political prisoners surveyed in the 1980s described at least one incidence of sexual torture and of 6,000 male concentration-camp inmates in Sarajevo fully 5,000 reported having been raped. Here it's important to reiterate the point made by the SG in his report. The vast majority of rape in conflict is perpetrated by men against women. However, naming men as victims should not detract from the urgency of meeting women's needs. Quite the opposite, it should strengthen calls for justice, as the Refugee Law Project's work has steadfastly maintained. Like those women, men raped in war also desperately need care and justice. In both cases, action has to be taken to address the consequences and hold the perpetrators accountable.

We've seen then that men are both perpetrators and victims of sexual violence in conflict. What gets less attention, but for the purposes of our work at Sonke and MenEngage is absolutely critical, is the role that men can play as agents of change.

Sonke recently completed a **documentary film on efforts to engage men and boys in achieving gender equality**. The film, titled "A Way to Justice" is available online at <http://www.vimeo.com/26553725> and features the stories of many men and women working across Africa to promote gender equality and social justice. It focuses especially on David Tamba and Pascal Akimana, both of whom narrowly survived war in their home countries of Sierra Leone and Burundi respectively. Both were forced to flee their homes and spent years moving from refugee camp to refugee camp, David in Liberia and Guinea, Pascal in the DRC, Kenya and Tanzania. At the age of twelve, Pascal was forced to witness the rape of his sister. David was unable to prevent rebel forces from abducting and raping his pregnant wife. Each gave serious thought to joining rebel forces to exact revenge but chose not to, in part because of the depression and trauma they both struggled with as a result of the violence they had witnessed and suffered.

Whilst living in a refugee camp, David was approached by a UNHCR protection officer, Lynn Ngugi, who convinced him to participate in camp activities aimed at preventing endemic sexual violence. Now, a decade later, David is the director of the Men's Association of Sierra Leone where he coordinates activities intended to increase men's support for Sierra Leone's three new gender equality laws. He also coordinates Sierra Leone's fledgling MenEngage country network.

After years of moving steadily southwards from Burundi, Pascal was invited to join a Men As Partners workshop at a clinic in Johannesburg's inner city. He was initially resistant to the ideas of gender equality discussed there but returned for subsequent workshops because they gave him a forum to discuss his trauma. He now works for Men's Resources International and is an emerging leader in the field of gender equality work with men and boys. David and Pascal's stories complicate the conventional discourses about men and violence against women in conflict settings, which, as I've said, typically depicts men only as part of the problem—as perpetrators, probable perpetrators or indifferent bystanders. David and Pascal's stories remind us that most men are deeply affected by violence against the women in their lives—their mothers, sisters, partners, wives—and often feel profoundly ashamed about their inability to prevent violence they experienced or suffered, or sometimes were forced to perpetrate. Men's reactions to experiencing sexual violence are even more complex since they're wrapped up in social stereotypes about what constitutes a 'real man'.

But Pascal and David remind us that not all men turn their shame, confusion and pain into fuel for further violence. Perhaps most significantly, their lives and the lives of many other men like them bear testimony to the importance of developing initiatives and tools to support men to act on their convictions that sexualised violence, against women, men, and children, is wrong and that they have a role to play in stopping it and in supporting gender equality and women's leadership.

At Sonke, our work is to engage men and boys in efforts to end gender based violence and to promote gender equality. While South Africa is not formally a conflict setting, one of the most terrible legacies of apartheid is that the levels of men's violence against women and against other men rival those in conflict settings. Men in South Africa are often depicted as deeply opposed to gender transformation and to women's rights. Our research shows that some men are indeed resistant to change and perceive women's rights as a threat to their privilege. Other research shows that nearly 27% of men have raped a woman in their lifetime and nearly half have battered a woman. Alarming, 5% report having raped a woman and 15% say they've abused a woman in the last year.

These are disturbing statistics. Yet, they only tell about a quarter of the story, and in that sense, they hide an important reality. Fully 73% of South African men indicate that they have not raped a woman, and 55% indicate that they have never assaulted a woman. Turned around like this, these statistics indicate that a majority of South African men do not use violence and a very large majority have not abused a woman recently, quite possibly because they know it's wrong and feel some remorse for the violence they did use. Our qualitative research with men in seven of South Africa's nine provinces shows that alongside the men who fear and are resistant to change, a significant number support change and believe women's rights are consistent with our new political dispensation. A smaller but still significant number argue that women's empowerment enriches their own lives and relationships.

Our work at Sonke is focused on mobilising these men to speak out, to take action in their own homes and communities to stop their own and other men's violence and to become activists for change. Our primary community education embodies this strengths based approach. It is called the One Man Can Campaign. As the name implies, the campaign affirms that men have a positive role to play in bringing about change and provides them with sequenced opportunities to reflect on the costs they bear when they adhere to rigid notions of manhood. The campaign also acknowledges that many men themselves grew up in homes where there was violence and so know the pain that many women endure. It calls on men to act on their convictions that violence is wrong and that it can be stopped. Increasingly men who have participated in One Man Can workshops are joining local

community action teams and self-identify as gender activists. Some now participate in political action to ensure that the courts hold perpetrators accountable and grant justice to survivors of violence. Some joined Sonke's campaign to hold a prominent political leader accountable for misogynist statements he made about rape survivors—a campaign which led the political leader in question to issue a public apology and retract his statements. Still others participate in a campaign to monitor police compliance with the provisions of the new Sexual Offences Act and visit police stations to assess their ability to meet the needs of rape survivors.

Sonke's successes in engaging men and boys as agents of change are by no means unique. As new programs engaging men and boys have been implemented, a broad body of effective evidence-based programming has emerged and confirmed that men and boys are willing to change their attitudes and practices and, sometimes, to take a stand for greater gender equality—whether in the rural Eastern Cape province of South Africa, the favelas of Rio de Janeiro or in New Delhi, India. Indeed impact evaluations keep confirming that with the right support, men can change their gender related attitudes and relations in relatively short periods of time. I hope I've given you reason to believe that it is possible to mobilise men to oppose men's violence against women and to make tangible changes in women's – and their own lives – by doing this. If this work is to make a significant difference at any kind of scale, if it is to bring about meaningful social change, it is necessary to use a range of social change strategies to generate a fundamental change in social norms about men's roles and responsibilities in ending violence against women. Work with men and boys for gender equality will need to happen at many levels and in multi-faceted ways, including some of the following strategies:

1. Roll-out community based workshops and dialogues to encourage large numbers of men and boys to reflect on the costs them and to women of adhering rigidly to narrow notions of manhood that equate manhood with dominance, aggression, sexual conquest, fearlessness and risk taking.
2. Challenge men in positions of power for their sexist, homophobic and exploitative approaches to others, and challenge the impunity their power so often grants them.
3. Promote healthy gender norms through community and mass media.
4. Build coalitions and networks with key partners, including women's rights organisations and networks.
5. Increase individual and institutional capacity to provide the psychosocial services needed to address pervasive trauma experienced by the large numbers of men and boys exposed to violence—whether in their homes or in armed conflict.

6. Develop and implement laws and policies at the national and international levels that sanction and deter men's violence and dominance over women, support existing processes of change, encourage large numbers of men to relate in equitable and caring ways and publicly celebrate these positive actions.
7. Engage in advocacy, activism and community mobilisation to ensure that national governments and international organisations implement the many policies and programmes to which they have committed.

Efforts to engage men and boys in achieving gender equality and ending men's violence have mostly taken the form of community education, typically workshops. These initiatives are critically important and need to be scaled up; they can bring about meaningful change in the attitudes and practices of the men who participate in them. However, by design, they reach relatively small numbers of men and boys—and typically not the men and boys who hold the power to really bring about large-scale change. Workshops and community dialogues are, in other words, vitally necessary but not sufficient. To make a real impact gender equality and accountability work has to reach men in positions of power—in multilateral institutions, national governments and political parties, non-state armed groups, the private sector and in other positions of authority.

One of the key tasks before us is to insist that those in positions of power in donor agencies and government foreign affairs departments, who are, of course, mostly men, recognise, prioritise and respond to the urgency of sexual violence in conflict by making available the funds needed to address it. The amount currently available is grossly inadequate to the task and the claims made about there not being money appallingly threadbare. It's hard not to see this as an example of women's needs being dismissed as not sufficiently important.

The Global Fund for Women made \$9 Million US Dollars available in grants last year. The United Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women has an annual operating budget of \$25 Million Dollars. UN Women has more than \$325 Million for 2011. Impressive work has gone into raising this money. Yet it is far from enough. We are told that there isn't more money available because of the recession. Yet, just today EU leaders meeting in Brussels provided 220 Billion Euros to bail out Greece and the banks holding its debt. This is one of many multi-billion Euro bail-outs granted in the last year or so. You'll remember that the US government made 700 Billion Dollars available to prevent an economic meltdown caused by deregulation and high risk investment and banking strategies.

We have to demand that more money be made available for other kinds of spending than shoring up banks and inadequate governments, and we have to insist that the horrendous but routine violence meted out to women across the world be treated as the emergency that it is.

One institution we should focus some of our attention on is the World Bank. Gender Action, a group that tracks spending on women's rights by international financial institutions (IFIs), report that IFIs "spend a tiny fraction of their multi-billion dollar budgets to directly address GBV, and in some cases actually exacerbate GBV through extractive industry and post-conflict investments that undermine women's and girls' safety and increase their vulnerability to violence." The report continues with examples: "in 2010, the World Bank (WB) allocated US\$1.98 million—or 0.01 percent of its budget for Sub-Saharan Africa—to address GBV in the South Kivu region of East Africa, where protracted conflict has led to sexual assaults against tens of thousands of women and girls (Oxfam, 2010). The WB website lists another WB investment to combat GBV in Cote D'Ivoire as not having any funding at all. As the WB does not provide any documentation on the aforementioned projects, it is impossible to determine their quality, including the extent to which women and girls participate in and benefit from project outcomes." (International Financial Institutions (IFIs) and Gender Based Violence (GBV): A Primer. Gender Action April 2011.)

Money is needed to rebuild health services to ensure that women and men who survive rape have access to the critical emergency services they need. Money is needed to rebuild criminal justice systems, including ensuring that survivors of rape have access to proper policing and forensic services, prosecutors, judges and impartial courts that are willing to hold perpetrators accountable. Money is needed to ensure that complainants in cases that go to the International Criminal Court have access to currently unfunded and largely unavailable witness protection programmes. And money is, of course, needed to roll out broad-based social norms campaigns to challenge harmful gender norms that contribute to men's use of sexual and domestic violence. The World Bank and donor countries, especially the G8 countries that have repeatedly committed and repeatedly failed to provide 0.7 percent of GDP to foreign aid, must live up to their promises. When they don't we have to engage in advocacy to make sure that they do.

It's not just donors who are not adequately following up on their obligations. National governments and regional bodies can and must do more too.

There is a lot we should expect and demand from **national governments**. Yet commitment and follow-through from regional bodies and national government is at best uneven. We should expect

that they use donor money in honest and transparent ways. Reports suggest that donor money often simply replaces existing budgetary commitments and allows governments to shift money previously committed in one department or ministry to another, resulting in the net amount for social development remaining the same while other budgets including for military spending or government salaries increase by the amount made available by donors for health or safety. The African Union declared this decade, 2010-2020 as the African Women's Decade. In Africa, political leaders have signed on to a range of human rights treaties and declarations of commitment, including CEDAW, Resolution 1325 and Resolution 1820. The Maputo Protocol specifies that there should be clear protections for women from sexual violence in situations of armed conflict. However, now 24 months into the African Women's Decade, governments across the continent have a lot of catching up to do.

Research indicates that over 200,000 women have been raped in the DRC since the start of conflict. The violence is ongoing. In one instance, between July 30th and August 4th, nearly 500 women and girls, and some boys and men, were raped in and around the village of Luvungi in the Eastern DRC in a campaign of ongoing terror waged by armed groups who use rape as a weapon of war. In the wake of that violence, however, neither the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo nor the relevant regional bodies issued statements condemning the violence. The African Union was silent and so were the Southern African Development Community, the East African Community and the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region, which has held numerous meetings to address sexual violence in the Great Lakes region.

And, of course, it's not just the DRC: the most recent elections in Zimbabwe saw ZANU-PF use widespread sexual violence to silence and intimidate women activists. That too was met with silence by political leaders in the region. In the wake of contested elections in Kenya, many women and some men were raped. Little action was taken until the ICC pressed charges and just last week determined that four senior politicians should face trial for allegedly coordinating widespread violence and intimidation. In my country, South Africa, we have great laws on the books but rates of domestic violence and sexual violence are the highest of any country not at war.

How can it be that the political leaders in our region remain so silent on this issue? It seems self-evident but it isn't said enough: this inaction reflects ongoing disregard for women's rights and dignity by male political leaders who value political allegiances over their stated commitments to women's rights as human rights.

The Secretary General has made many public commitments to put the full weight of the UN system behind efforts to end violence against women. As part of the UNITE to End Violence Against Women campaign he has put together what is called the Network of Men Leaders, on which I serve. It includes many influential men whose voices could make a real difference. However, even though it was established over two years ago, it is yet to meet and has no clear programme or plan of action. He and other leaders in the UN can and must do more.

A core principle of the battered women's movement is that perpetrators have to be held accountable if the violence is to stop. When perpetrators are senior government officials, the UN can exert pressure on regional bodies and on the International Criminal Court to take swift action. The UN can also borrow from the European Union which has developed the practice of including human rights provisions in their preferential trade agreements and put pressure on the World Bank and the IMF to link loans to human rights adherence.

The UN also has a key role to play in ensuring that it strengthens its response in places like the DRC by increasing the number of peacekeepers on the ground and by mobilising resources to provide the healthcare and medical services so desperately needed by women at the moment.

Perhaps most critically, UN member states must get back to their commitment to end discrimination against women, in whatever form it takes, as laid out in CEDAW. The so-called women, peace and security agenda is not a replacement for ending discrimination, as it seems in so many contexts to have become. It is fundamentally a means to support gender equality and women's empowerment. Work on women, peace and security should always be funded and carried out with an agenda for significant social change at its core: only such an approach will challenge and overcome men's current domination. To achieve this end, the UN should work with its many partners, including with bilateral donors, to ensure that local women's rights organisations and affected women have the resources they need to continue the important work they do to challenge their exclusion and to bring about change at every level. Without economic and political support women's rights activists will not be able to participate meaningfully in peace negotiations, peace building processes, or institutional reform including through more effective security governance. If they are not involved in these discussions, as we see time and time again, women's rights are all too likely to be compromised in the name of political expediency.

I think all of us here tonight will agree that the task of ending sexual violence is urgent and demands an immediate infusion of financial resources and political will. I hope I've made the case that it also

requires that we think differently about men's roles and their potential as agents of positive change. 2015 provides us with a useful benchmark: it is the due date for achieving the Millennium Development Goals, the 20th anniversary of the Beijing Platform for Action, and the 15th anniversary of Security Council Resolution 1325. If we're to achieve much between now and then we're almost certainly going to have to demand more from our national governments, from our regional bodies and from the UN itself. We'll be far more effective in achieving this if women are not expected to end discrimination against them on their own – an impossible task. It is time for men to step forward to play their part.

Mandl: Thank you very much, Mr. Peacock, for this insight into the practical aspects of work with men. We will now hear from Dr. Seifert.

Seifert: My topic is gender dynamics which start at the onset of conflict and continue until what is generally called conflict settlement. In the previous presentations gender issues were handled as policy issues. I would like to throw some more light on social and cultural constructions of gender, the analysis of which it might make it easier to understand why it is so difficult to implement gender policies. If we talk about the „genderedness“ of armed conflicts basically three aspects are addressed: First, we are talking about the fact that by now we have a number of indicators that gender or gender dynamics are a necessary ingredient in prewar developments, i.e. a certain kind of gender dynamics is necessary in the onset of armed conflicts. Second – and this aspect is probably most discussed and plays a great role in legal documents produced in the past fifteen years – that men and women are differently exposed to and hit by armed conflicts and are assigned different roles and positions in the preparation and conduct of wars. Third, that in order to gain a sustainable peace order and social structure after something like a peace settlement has been reached, the gender order has to be considered and constructed in a way that is conducive to peaceful social and political developments. Before dealing with two of these aspects (the first and the last) in more detail I think it is necessary to emphasize that a) gender is not to be seen as an independent variable that could explain the causes of armed conflicts in the last instance. I am saying that because this has been claimed in theoretical approaches which I would attribute to first wave feminist analyses, which occupied a prominent place in the German speaking area for a long time. We had the discussion that masculinities were responsible for wars in general. That is not what I will argue. From this it follows that when we search for the causes – or probably a better word would be background conditions – of armed conflicts, of course we cannot look at gender only. Rather, we should direct our attention to the intermingling of gender dynamics with other essential areas of analyses such as economics, social

inequality and the struggle between classes and other social groups as well as developments in the international system.

Probably the most difficult question because it is grossly under-theorised and under-researched is to what extent and in what way we can imagine gender to enter the dynamics leading to armed conflict.

The research at our disposal points to the fact that we have to consider:

- a) the gender arrangements and their intermingling with other social constellations and dynamics that are conducive to bringing about armed conflict and
- b) the gender discourses and their links to other political and cultural discourses which are necessarily produced at the onset of armed conflict to legitimize the use of force.

As this will sound rather theoretical, I will exemplify this with some empirical data. First I want to mention a study presented by Caprioli that gives some hints that the gender arrangement in a society has something to do with the propensity of a society to engage in armed conflict. Caprioli's quantitative studies show that a high degree of gender equality correlates with a low propensity to employ arms to settle a conflict. And vice versa, that a high degree of gender inequality increases the propensity of a state to use military means in conflict settlement. Countries with a higher sensitivity for gender equality according to this study are more likely to settle conflicts by diplomatic means and to enter into compromises than states that – according to certain indicators – are insensitive to gender equality. (These indicators are of a political, social and economic nature and are operationalised e.g. by access to active and passive electoral rights and to political offices; access to education and health services; control over one's own body and participation in the labor market; Caprioli 2000).

Quantitative studies are interesting but do not tell us anything about the qualitative context behind the data. Therefore I would like to present a qualitative study that has been presented by Blagojevic examining the armed conflict in the former Yugoslavia. She describes prewar gender relations in Serbia as traditional, heteronormative, rigid and inflexible. While on the one hand, the Communist Party displayed a rhetoric of gender equality and, indeed, produced some success in gender equity, on the other hand, traditional gender discourses and expectations persisted in social and cultural life. To be sure, female labor market participation was the rule and the access women had to political office was exemplary. Nevertheless, so Blagojevic, this did not change thinking about gender and the organisation of gender in everyday life.

This became a problem when the country slid into large-scale economic turmoil in the 1980s which resulted in a galloping deprofessionalisation of male jobs and as a result a loss of the importance of men in social life. Female resources and female networks became increasingly important in providing for families. This also meant that men could no longer live up to traditional expectations on masculinity. Male alcohol and drug consumption soared in the late 80s and early 90s; male life expectancy decreased notably and domestic violence rose to unprecedented dimensions.

Blagojevic considers the ensuing explosion of traditional gender discourses that contained a construction of men as fighters and combatants, as “soldiers for the fatherland” and “defenders of the nation” as directly correlated with these developments. They furnished what we call “subject-positions” (Subjektpositionen) or, if you wish, identities that were a subjective precondition for a mobilization for armed conflict. One can conclude that in prewar Serbia masculinity dynamics developed that cannot be called a “cause of war” but that decidedly supported a violent dynamics of social and political dynamics. Moreover, these masculinity developments were used, supported and exacerbated by identity entrepreneurs that had a vested interest in a violent development of the socio-economic and political conflicts.

This shows that gender crises become virulent when developments in other social spheres make it impossible to live traditional masculinity and if no other gender positions are available that might alleviate the situation on a subjective level. While Blagojevic’s example refers to Serbia, similar dynamics have been described for Northern Uganda. The study in Northern Uganda was conducted by Chris Dolan who arrived at similar results. He also argues that a specific kind of gender subjectivity was crucial for the development of the conflict. What developed was a mixture of precolonial, colonial and postcolonial gender images – resulted in defining gender in a very binary way. Men were defined as more powerful and seen as responsible for women’s lives. They were also expected to have and be able to maintain a family. At the same time, the situation was such that it was blatantly impossible to live up to these images, which resulted in feelings of humiliation and frustration, which led to propensity to resort to violence.

The scenarios described can exemplify the role of gender in a prewar context. Now I want to outline the role of the category gender in what is generally called conflict resolution. In conflict resolution, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are the key words. We know by now that both processes lead to an intermingling of diverse cultures and identities in the host societies, and this also concerns gender arrangements.

When talking about the intermingling of identities, it has to be made clear that the political weights of the different identities are not on an equal level, the host countries being in a weaker position. The most important institutions of peacekeeping and peacebuilding have a considerable social, political, economic and thus formative power in areas of deployment. Peacekeeping forces have a clearly privileged status as have UN organizations and mostly also NGOs.

They have generally great political power they provide money, furnish jobs and contribute to the economic survival. Assuming – as sociologists would do – that institutions are loci where gender constructions are produced, practiced and circulated and that the effectiveness of gender discourses depends on the power of the organizations that produce them, we have to also assume that international organizations are an important loci of gender discourses in post conflict situations.

International organizations have a formal and an informal level. Characteristically, the gender discourses produced on a formal level – that is political programs such as gender mainstreaming, gender equity policies and the like – are counter-acted by gender practices on an informal level and create a contradiction that seems to be characteristic for all postconflict scenarios. Thus, gender arrangements after armed conflicts are more often than not heavily influenced by practices (such as prostitution, particularly when associated with the military) that are introduced by an international presence and that are based on gender discourses imported from sender nations. Obviously, gender discourses and gender practices in these sender nations do not exactly live up to the gender policies pursued officially in postconflict reconstruction. To give an example, as a result of international intervention, in Croatia the sex industry became the biggest growth industry, if you want to call it that, in the country. In Cambodia, one result of the UN intervention was that the country that was virtually free of AIDS became one of the regions with the highest AIDS rates in the world.

If – as many studies argue – the cultural construction of gender and the gender arrangements in a given society are an important component in constructing a social and political system less prone to violent conflict resolution, then obviously the conduct of military and civilian peacekeepers and -builders and the policies in postwar reconstruction are of vital importance and have been underrated. Also, when we talk about present day postwar reconstruction, we have to take into consideration that it takes place within what is commonly called the „liberal peace model“ which also has gender implications. “Liberal peace” denotes a model of conflict resolution that is premised on the belief that “good governance” should be the main path to be followed. “Good governance” means reconstructing societies under the imperatives of a liberal market economy and “advanced” Western-style models of civil society, equality and human rights – which, however, do not include economic equality or social rights to any extent worth mentioning. Liberal Peace requires the

individual to be “free” and to creatively pursue his or her economic interest. Thus, the World Bank states that in order to gain “good governance”, behavior in post-conflict regions must be altered from wartime to a peacetime mentality. While there is nothing wrong with that it is important to note that the emphasis is totally on mentalities not on the economic and social conditions that make it possible for people to lead a peaceful existence. The emphasis on behavior and mentalities has consequences for gender arrangements. Because liberal peace is linked to a capitalist market economy that typically entails the dismantling of social rights, social protection and public welfare positions. In the wake of this, care tasks are no longer taken care of by the state. In the wake of these developments, traditional gender roles are re-awakened and care tasks are shifted back to individual households and that means to women. The ideological background for these developments is – to emphasize this again – the re-awakening of traditional, in some regions fundamentalist gender positions. Thus, while on the one hand “liberal peace” presents itself as modern, advanced and premised on gender equality, the dynamics that unfold in the wake of neoliberal policies and behind the backs of the actors at the same time erode and intensify gender boundaries. As a result, we cannot say that liberal or neoliberal postwar reconstruction goes hand in hand with gender equalities. Rather, we are in a volatile situation that may go in both directions.

To conclude, I wish to point out that at the onset of armed conflicts, gendered factors can play a role that is conducive or detrimental to a peaceful reconstruction effort. Therefore, they should not escape the attention of theoreticians or practitioners of reconstruction.

As a result, neither analyses of armed conflict nor practical strategies of peace building can neglect gender as an important category. Gender has to be taken into consideration along with economic, social and political circumstances. Thus, gender strategies have to enter reconstruction efforts and if they are to be successful they cannot remain on a “governance” or technical level, but must take into account the consequences of the whole array of reconstruction measures and their impact on social structures. Since this, however, is a deeply political and not merely a technical issue or one of „good governance” this is probably easier said than done.

Mandl: Vielen Dank für die profunde Analyse der Kategorie Geschlecht vor, während und nach Kriegen. Sie haben uns sehr interessant aufgezeigt und kritisch hinterfragt, wie Genderrollen von den Kriegstreibern instrumentalisiert werden können. Jetzt übergebe ich das Wort an das Publikum.

Publikumsdiskussion

In der ersten Fragerunde wurden die folgenden Fragen an die ReferentInnen gestellt:



- 1) Was ist die Rolle der ZivilakteurInnen, zum Beispiel der MitarbeiterInnen der NGOs, in sexualisierter Gewalt in Post-Konflikt Gesellschaften?
- 2) Frage an Dr. Seifert: In Bezug auf das Ausnutzen von männlichen Identitäten in Vorkriegsgesellschaften, könnte so etwas im heutigen Europa passieren?
- 3) Frage an Mr. Dean Peacock: Wie sieht ein Change-Prozess eigentlich aus?
- 4) Wie reagieren die Mütter und Schwestern der Täter, sind sie hilflos, warum, welche Faktoren spielen da Rolle?

Schäfer: Wir wissen, dass für das UN-Personal und das betrifft nicht nur die militärischen Kontingente sondern auch die zivilen, Nulltoleranz-Richtlinien herrschen. Jedes Vergehen soll bestraft werden. Wie weit das in der Praxis umgesetzt wird ist aber nicht so klar. Es geht da auch nicht nur darum, die Gewalt zu sanktionieren und zu reduzieren, sondern das Ansehen der UN nicht weiter zu schädigen.

Wenn wir uns andere Organisationen anschauen, hängt es meistens von den Arbeitsverträgen ab. Wir haben viel über negative Beispiele gesprochen, deswegen möchte ich ein positives Beispiel nennen und was ich hier exemplarisch erwähnen möchte, sind nicht nur die Arbeitsverträge, sondern auch das Gendertraining von Oxfam, die nicht nur das internationale, sondern auch das lokale Personal betreffen. Da auch das lokale Personal oft ihre Machtposition zum Beispiel in Flüchtlingslagern missbraucht. Bei Oxfam bekommt der, der Missbrauch tätigt, seinen Vertrag terminiert und kann auch mit strafrechtlichen Konsequenzen rechnen, wenn es zum Beispiel um Übergriffe auf minderjährige Mädchen geht. Hier gibt es also eine ganz klare Personalpolitik.

Oxfam organisiert auch im Vorfeld Gendertrainings. Viele Personen gehen mit guten Willen in diesen Bereich, sind aber sich dessen nicht bewusst, was die Arbeit vor Ort bedeutet, was z.B. die üblichen Freizeitbeschäftigungen sind. Vielleicht ist es üblich an Wochenenden in ein Bordell zu gehen und dann wird normalerweise nicht gefragt, wer dort arbeitet. Das Verhalten von ausländischen EntwicklungsexpertInnen und die MitarbeiterInnen humanitärer Organisationen werden von der lokalen Bevölkerung beobachtet, mehr als es ihnen lieb ist. In diesen Trainings werden unterschiedlichste Problemsituationen erlernt und Lösungsstrategien geübt. Was soll man tun, wenn

ein Mitarbeiter oder ein Vorgesetzter Mädchen missbraucht? Wie geht man damit um? Außerdem: Wo beginnt die Grauzone zwischen Partnerschaften, Freundschaften, Liebschaften, etc., wenn man 2-3 Jahre irgendwo tätig ist und wo fängt der Missbrauch eigentlich an?

Ein anderer Aspekt, der viele rechtliche und gesundheitliche Fragen aufwirft, sind die HIV-Raten unter diesem Personal, die viel höher als in anderen Arbeitsbereichen sind. Wo werden diese erworben und wie breitet sich die Epidemie weiter aus? Das sind wichtige Fragen.

Seifert: Die erwähnten Studien haben deutlich gezeigt, dass in der Vorkriegsphase ein Widerspruch entsteht zwischen Männlichkeitskonstruktionen und was in einer Gesellschaft wirklich erlebt wird. Die Antwort liegt in der Schaffung von alternativen Subjektpositionen. Generell gilt die Einschätzung, dass die westlichen Gesellschaften hochgradig individualisiert sind und in der Folge eine größere Palette an möglichen Identitäten anbieten. Ob bestimmte Gruppen in Europa für Gewalt mobilisierbar sind, das ist eine offene Frage. Männlichkeit wird oft mit Nationalismus verknüpft, deshalb könnte so etwas vielleicht theoretisch in den Rahmen von Nationalisierung passieren.

Peacock: Within the Men Engage Alliance there are sets of principles that organizations have to adhere to if they are to be members. We had a situation with a group from a neighboring country. They were visiting in town and later we heard that they had brought sex workers to the hotel and abused them. We insisted that they address this, we didn't prescribe how, but we requested evidence that they are addressing the situation in an appropriate manner; otherwise we would ask them to leave the alliance. The challenge is to keep the integrity of the work as you attempt to increase the impact of the work.

The issue around sexual exploitation is very complicated. What we define as sexual exploitation is much contested. In South Africa the feminist movement has a very clear position on sex work, requesting that it has to be decriminalized. We know that sex workers are currently exploited by the police. If we support the feminist organizations in their struggle, does that mean that it is OK for our co-workers to use their services? Some say it's a business transaction, like buying a sandwich. For me that is difficult to accept. As far as processes of change are concerned – I believe it could be said that it lies in creating different subject positions for the men involved. In South Africa it is easier because you have men who are clearly identified as freedom fighters. Many of my colleagues view themselves as a part of the liberation movement. They articulate clearly that this is the next phase - first we fought for political rights, now we fight for equality, so that everyone can exercise these rights. By linking this struggle with our previous struggle, we are able to offer alternative subject positions that resonate with our recent history. We are not asking men to step back into communities where they are ostracised. We want to reach out to the community. We work with big national media – radio,

soap operas (where we make sure that story lines tap into what we do. For example national celebrities wear our T-shirts on TV). Giving people a range of different options in the public domain is a prerequisite for change. We run lots of workshops where we help men think through with their feelings, for example in areas where unemployment is high we make it clear to men to see that not their own failures, but as a consequence of an unequal society. What's also important is that we help guys recognize that also other men help at home, for example. Many men are willing to help their wives with household chores, but do so secretly, because they think no other men do. We are therefore giving them a sense of permission to step out on how they are living their lives and not based on their assumptions how other men live their lives.

We take the work of holding political leaders accountable very seriously. When a local politician said that the woman who accused the deputy president for rape was not only not raped, but enjoyed the night she spent with him, we took him to court and accused him of hate speech. We won, the court forced him to make a public apology which he refused to do, so we took him to court again. He was ordered to pay.

On the question how mothers feel, to be honest, there are certainly many women who are complicit in constructing manhood in ways that is bad both for men and women. In regard to how men justify their violence when they also have women in their lives, I can say that there was a workshop in which we asked the men "How would you feel if it was perpetrated against your mother" and they all said "No, no, out of the question", but when asked what if it happened to your sister, many answered that that depends how she behaved, what kind of clothes she wore, if she maybe wanted it etc. These are some pretty alarming positions that must be worked with.

In der zweiten Fragerunde wurden folgende Fragen gestellt:



- 1) Wie müssen männliche und weibliche Identitäten in einer Gesellschaft aufgebaut sein? Wie muss das System sein, damit eine Diskussion über Macht stattfindet?
- 2) What is the role of NGOs and the UN in constructing femininity as the weaker sex?

The UN perpetuates the construction of femininity as the weaker sex, as we can observe peacekeepers are always men! In Ghana we have queen mothers who are very respected who could help in conflict resolution and peace building, why is no use made of such potentials?

- 3) There is a need to go deeper into the roots of the conflict, and that is a lack of political and economic equality in pre-conflict societies. Poverty has already in the eighties been recognized

as a very important element leading to conflict. Are evaluations of projects made, are experiences exchanged among different actors?

- 4) To Mr. Peacock : Violence against women is found all over the world. In your opinion, is it due to a lack of moral values, lack of education or lack of strict law?

Seifert: Ich stimme zu, dass die Schlussfolgerung gezogen werden kann, dass einige Organisationen die Frage der sozialen Gerechtigkeit gegen Gendergerechtigkeit ausspielen. Gendergleichheit ist ein Schlüsselwort in Weltbankprojekten, aber wenn man die Sache genauer angeht, sehen wir, dass diese Forderungen nach Gendergleichheit keine sozialen, ökonomischen Dimensionen umfassen. Es kann gesagt werden, dass die Weltbank eine Gleichstellung bestimmter privilegierter Frauen und bestimmter privilegierter Männern im Auge hat, während die Anderen dem Blick der Weltbank entgehen. Wenn man sich nur mit der Frage der Gendergleichheit beschäftigt, dann entgeht einem was sich unterhalb dieser Ebene abspielt. Da entstehen eigentlich zwei Genderordnungen, die Privilegierte und die Unterprivilegierte. Ökonomische Faktoren spielen für die Gendergleichheit eine sehr wichtige Rolle und sollten nicht ignoriert werden.

In Bezug auf die allererste Frage, die sich auf die Studien von Caprioli bezogen hat: diese Studien sind rein quantitative Studien und beantworten die Frage nicht, wie sich diese Daten erklären. Solche Erklärungen können nur qualitative Studien liefern. Eine mögliche Interpretation wäre, dass, wenn es mehrere bestimmte Genderpositionen gibt, die bei größerer Gendergleichstellung vorhanden sind, der subjektive Druck den traditionellen Erwartungen gerecht zu werden nicht mehr so stark ist.

Was die Sexualität angeht, die definieren wir nicht als Eigenschaft, sondern als Konstruktion, d.h. als ein Prozess der von außen formbar ist. Dazu möchte ich ein Beispiel nennen: Wenn die US-Armee, die eine sehr stark sexualisierte Armee ist, ihre Truppen während der Golfkriege nach Saudi Arabien geschickt hat, wo es keine Militärbordelle gab, gab es eine große Angst, wie die Soldaten damit umgehen werden. Also hat sich die US-Armee dazu entschlossen den Sexualität-Diskurs einfach zu verändern. Da wurde einfach gesagt: Ein richtiger Soldat kann sechs oder sieben Monate ohne Sexualität auskommen. Es gab Zweifel, ob es gelingen würde, aber man hatte keine Alternativen. Im Endeffekt zeigte es sich als problemlos durchsetzbar.

Ich glaube, etwas Ähnliches passiert auch mit den männlichen Mitarbeitern der UNO und NGOs. Ihr Verhalten hängt davon ab, welche Verhaltensmöglichkeiten ihnen zur Verfügung stehen. Wenn sich zum Beispiel hohe UN-Beamte der Zwangsprostitution bedienen und alle wissen das und nichts passiert, dient das als ein negatives Verhaltensmodell. Gleichzeitig ist das für die Mitarbeiter der NGOs normalerweise nicht möglich. Infolge benehmen sich die Mitarbeiter der UNO anders als die Mitarbeiter der NGOs. Das Problem ist also nicht die Männlichkeit selbst, sondern die akzeptierten Verhaltensmodelle in bestimmten Organisationen.

Schäfer: Denen, die sich für das Thema der NGO und UN-Mitarbeiter in Nachkriegsgesellschaften interessieren, möchte ich ein Buch empfehlen. Das Buch heißt „Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping in Liberia, Kosovo and Haiti“ und ist von Paul Higate und Marsha Henry. Ich möchte zwei Beispiele nennen, die uns zeigen, wie die lokalen Menschen das internationale Personal einschätzen.

In Liberia und Sierra Leone waren militärische Einheiten präsent, um Frieden zu schaffen. Das englische Wort „peacekeeper“ wurde neu-akzentuiert in die lokale Sprache übersetzt: nicht als „peacekeeper“, sondern als „beachkeeper“, also diejenigen, die den Strand überwachen. Warum? Weil die Lokale, wo Alkohol gekauft wird und wo man Kontakte mit Mädchen knüpfen kann, sich am Strand befinden und das Personal, das Frieden stiften sollte, nicht in gefährlichen Wohnbezirken anzutreffen war, sondern genau da am Strand. Es ist oft gefährlich Friedensstifter zu sein, weil man die Sprache und die Umgangsformen nicht kennt. Das obengenannte Buch behandelt ebendiese Probleme.

Eine weitere Gruppe, von der noch nicht gesprochen wurde und die stark in diesen Gebieten repräsentiert ist, sind die Mitarbeiter von Sicherheitsfirmen, die auch eine gewisse militarisierte Männlichkeit mit sich bringen. Sie sind meistens entlassene Soldaten und es bestehen viele rechtliche Grauzonen nach welchen Kriterien sie in Fällen von Missbrauch bestraft werden sollen.

Ich möchte noch erwähnen, dass es Debatten gibt die UN-Einheiten neu zu strukturieren und demobilisierte Ex-Kämpferinnen für Friedensmissionen auszubilden, weil sie in ihren Herkunftsgesellschaften keine Chancen mehr haben, weil sie keinen Weiblichkeitsbildern entsprechen. Diese Frauen können oder wollen oft nicht in ihre Gesellschaften zurück. Ich finde diese Idee interessant.

Peacock: To answer the question whether values explain violence better than the existence or the lack of laws: I don't think it's an either or. We must look into the structural forces at play. We know that the greatest predictor of endemic violence against women is inequality. It is now clear to us that capitalism is corrupt in the way that it operates, and at the same time it is the same people who created the problem that are now called upon to provide the solutions. How to address that problem, how to achieve change in that regard, I am not so sure. But I am optimistic that we can influence individual men and empower them to bring about change.

Profile der ExpertInnen

Mag.^a Sabine Mandl ist Forscherin am Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Menschenrechte und Lektorin an der Historischen Fakultät der Universität Wien. Gegenwärtig ist sie zuständig für das EU-Projekt “Stärkung der Kapazitäten von Frauen in Friedensprozessen im Südkaukasus”. Frau Mandl ist Mitglied der Arbeitsgruppe “FreundInnen der UNSC-Resolution 1325”. Ihre Veröffentlichungen umfassen einen Unterrichtsleitfaden zu „Krieg und bewaffnete Konflikte – ohne Frauen keinen Frieden“ (Sondernummer Polis Aktuell, Nr. 8, 2010) und eine Desk-Studie zu Frauenrechten, Frieden und Demokratie in Georgien, Armenien und Aserbaidschan.

Dr. Rita Schäfer ist unabhängige Forscherin, Lehrbeauftragte und Beraterin. Sie erstellte Studien zu Gender-Themen in Kriegen und zur Konstruktion von Männlichkeit in Konflikten und Nach-Konflikt-Gesellschaften in Afrika (Südafrika, Simbabwe, Namibia und Sierra Leone). Zudem forschte sie über Frauenrechte und die Rolle lokaler Frauenorganisationen in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Frau Schäfer veröffentlichte mehrere Bücher, u.a. „Frauen und Kriege in Afrika (2008)“ oder „Im Schatten der Apartheid (2008)“.

Dean Peacock ist Direktor und Mitbegründer des Sonke Gender Justice Network in Südafrika und der MenEngage Alliance. Er ist außerdem Mitglied des Netzwerkes leitender Männer, die den UN-Generalsekretär in der UN-Kampagne zur Überwindung der Gewalt gegen Frauen beraten. Zudem ist er im Beratungskomitee der NobelpreisträgerInnen zur Beendigung der sexualisierten Gewalt in Kriegen vertreten. Seine wissenschaftlichen Artikel wurden in vielen Sammelbänden und Fachzeitschriften veröffentlicht, u.a. in The Lancet, The Journal of AIDS und im American Journal of Public Health.

Prof. Dr. Ruth Seifert ist Professorin für Soziologie an der Hochschule Regensburg. Ihre aktuellen Forschungsthemen sind Gender und Kriege, Maskulinität vor und nach Kriegen, Wiederaufbau von Post-Konflikt-Gesellschaften, feministische Theorie, Militärsoziologie. Sie führte ein Forschungsprojekt des Österreichischen Ministeriums für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur zu „Kriegserfahrungen, Identität und Gender“ mit Flüchtlingen in Bosnien und Kosovo durch. Frau Seifert ist (Co-)Autorin mehrerer Bücher: „Gender, Identität und kriegerischer Konflikt“, „Das Beispiel des ehemaligen Jugoslawien (2004)“, „Gender und Militär (2004)“ und „Gender dynamics and post-conflict reconstruction (2009)“.